# STATE OF MICHIGAN MICHIGAN ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING SYSTEM ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

### IN THE MATTER OF:

		Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	2013-23088 3055 May 7, 2013 Oakland County DHS #3				
Αľ	OMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Carmen G.	Fahie					
	HEARING DECISION FOR INTENT	IONAL PROGRAM V	<u>IOLATION</u>				
an he La	nis matter is before the undersigned Administration of MCL 400.37 upon the Departm ent of Hurbering. After due notice, a telephone hearing insing, Michigan. The Depar tment was represe Office of Inspector General (OIG).	nan Servic es' (Depai I was held on Tuesda	rtment) request for a				
	Participants on behalf of Respondent inclu	ded:					
pu	Respondent did not appear at the hearing a trsuant to 7 CFR 273.16(e), Mich Admin Co. 0.3178(5).		•				
	ISSUE	<u>:s</u>					
1.	Did Respondent receive an overissuance (	OI) of					
	☐ Family Independence Program (FIP) ☐ State Disability Assistance (SDA) ☐ Medical Assistance (MA) benefits that the Department is entitled to re		Program (FAP) ent and Care (CDC)				
2.	Did Respondent commit an Intentional Program Violation (IPV)?						
3.	3. Should Respondent be disqualified from receiving						
	☐ Family Independence Program (FIP) ☐ State Disability Assistance (SDA)	∑ Food Assistance      ☐ Child Developme	Program (FAP) ent and Care (CDC)?				

# **FINDINGS OF FACT**

The Administrative Law Judge, based on t he competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

# 201323088/CGF

1.	The Department's OIG filed a hearing request on January 3, 2013 to establish an OI of benefits received by Respondent as a result of Respondent thaving alleged ly committed an IPV.
2.	The OIG $\boxtimes$ has $\square$ has not requested that Resp ondent be dis qualified fr om receiving program benefits.
3.	Respondent was a recipient of $\square$ FIP $\boxtimes$ FAP $\square$ SDA $\square$ CDC $\square$ MA benefits during the period of December 1, 2011 through October 31, 2012.
4.	On the Redetermination Application, 1010, signed by Respondent on June 27, 2011, Respondent reported that she/he intended to stay in Michigan.
5.	Respondent $\boxtimes$ was $\square$ was not aware of the responsib lility to report changes in her/his residence to the Department where the respondent us ed FAP benefits exclusively in the State of Georgia and Mi ssissippi for over thirty (30) consecutive days.
6.	Respondent had no apparent physical or m ental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement.
7.	The Department's OIG indicates that the time period they are considering the fraud period is December 1, 2011 through October 31, 2012.
8.	Respondent began using $\boxtimes$ FAP $\square$ FIP $\square$ MA $\square$ SDA benefits outside of the State of Michigan beginning in October 2011.
9.	During the alleged fr aud period, Respondent was issued \$ in ☐ FIP ☒ FAP ☐ SDA ☐ CDC ☐ MA benefits from the State of Michigan.
10	. Respondent was entitled to \$0 in $\square$ FIP $\boxtimes$ FAP $\square$ SDA $\square$ CDC $\square$ MA during this time period.
11	. Respondent⊠ did ☐ did not receive an OI in the amount of \$ under the ☐ FIP ☑ FAP ☐ SDA ☐ CDC ☐ MA program.
12	. The Department $oxtimes$ has $\odots$ has not established that Respondent committed an IPV.
13	.This was Respondent's ⊠ first ☐ second ☐ third IPV.
14	. A notice of hearing was mailed to Respondent at the last known address and $\boxtimes$ was $\square$ was not returned by the US Post Office as undeliverable.

# **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

Department policies are contained in the Br idges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

# 201323088/CGF ☐ The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and W ork Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, 42 USC 601, et seq. The Department (formerly k nown as the Family Independence Agency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, Rule 400.3101 through Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective October 1, 1996. ☐ The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp (FS) program] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and is implemented by the federal regulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Federal

☐ The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The D epartment of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 20 00 AACS, Rule 400.3151 through Rule 400.3180.

pursuant to MCL 400.10,

Regulations (CFR). The Agency) administers FAP

400.3001 through Rule 400.3015.

Department (formerly known as the Family Independenc e

et seg., and 1999 AC, Rule

☐ The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles IVA, IVE and XX of the Soc ial Security Act, the Child Care and Development Block Grant of 1990, and the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. The program is implemented by Title 45 of the Code of Feder al Regulations, Parts 98 and 99. The Department provides services to adults and children pursuant to MCL 400.14(1) and 1999 AC, Rule 400.5001 through Rule 400.5015.

☐ The Medical Ass istance (MA) program is es tablished by the Title XIX of the Soc ial Security Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independ ence Agency) administers the MA pr ogram pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MC L 400.105.

When a client group receives more benefits than they are entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the OI. BAM 700.

Suspected IPV means an OI exists for which all three of the following conditions exist:

- The client intentionally failed t o report information or intentionally gave incomplete or inaccurate information needed to make a correct benefit determination, and
- The client was clearly and co rrectly instructed regarding his or her reporting responsibilities, and
- The client has no apparent physical or mental impairment that limits his or her understanding or ability to fulfill their reporting responsibilities.

### 201323088/CGF

IPV is sus pected when there is clear and convinc ing evidence that the client has intentionally withheld or misr epresented information for the purpose of establishing, maintaining, increasing or preventing reduction of program benefits or eligibility. BAM 720.

The Department's OIG requests IPV hearings for cases when:

- benefit overissuanc es are not forwarded to the prosecutor,
- prosecution of welfare fraud is declined by the prosecutor for a reason other than lack of evidence, and
- the total overissuance amount is \$1000 or more, or
- the total overissuance amount is less than \$1000, and
  - the group has a previ ous intentional program violation, or
  - the alleged IPV involves FAP trafficking, or
  - the alleged fraud involves c oncurrent receipt of assistance.
  - the alleged fraud is committed by a state/government employee.

A court or hearing decision that finds a client committed an IP V disqualifies that client from receiving certain program benefits. A disqualified reci pient remains a member of an active group as long as he lives with them. Other eligib le group members may continue to receive benefits. BAM 720.

Clients who commit an IPV are disqualified for a standard disqualification period except when a court orders a different period, or except when the overissuance relates to MA. Refusal to repay will not cause denial of current or future MA if the client is otherwise eligible. BAM 710. Clients are disqualified for periods of one year for the first IPV, two years for the second IPV, lifet ime disqualification for the third IPV, and ten years for a concurrent receipt of benefits. BAM 720.

Additionally, the respondent failed to report her/her change in res idency from the State of Michigan and earned income from employ ment to the department, which resulted in his/her receiving an overissuance of F AP benefits of \$2,200 that the department is required to recoup.

### **DECISION AND ORDER**

۱h	e Ac	lmınıstr	ative	Law ،	Judge,	based	upon	the	above	Finding	s of	Fact	and	Conclu	isions
of	Law	, and fo	r the	reasc	ons sta	ted on	the re	cord	I, concl	ludes th	at:				

I. Respondent	☑ did ☐ did not commit an IPV.	
	$\boxtimes$ did $\square$ did not receive an OI of prog ram benefits in the amount the following program(s) $\square$ FIP $\boxtimes$ FAP $\square$ SDA $\square$ CDC $\square$ MA.	0

201323088/CGF									
The Department is ORDERED to delete the OI and cease any recoupment action.									
The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment procedures for the amount of in accordance with Department policy.									
☐ The Department is ORDERED to accordance with Department policy.	reduce the OI to	for the period ,	in						
☑ It is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent be disqualified from									
☐ FIP ☑ FAP ☐ SDA for a period of ☐ 12 months. ☐ 24 months. ☐ lifetime.									

<u>/s/</u>

Carmen G. Fahie Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

in

Date Signed: May 17, 2013

Date Mailed: May 20, 2013

**NOTICE**: The law pr ovides that within 30 days of receipt of the above Decision and Order, the Respondent may appeal it to the circuit court for the county in which he/she lives.

## CGF/hj

CC:

